



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,985	11/30/2000	David M. Morlitz	POU9-2000-0027-US1	2120

7590 05/09/2003

Philmore H. Colburn II
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART. UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
-----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

82

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/726,985

Applicant(s)

MORLITZ, DAVID M.

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 8, line 2, Fig. 4 should be changed to Fig. 3, for the purpose of consistency between the description and the drawing. Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: "resouorces" should be changed to "resources". Appropriate correction is required.
3. Claims 58, 61, 64, 65 are objected to because of the following informalities: "...implement:." should be changed to "...implement:". Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1, 2 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "hard disk", with reference 26, 34 would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A *descriptive* textual label for *numbered elements* 68, 70, 74, 78, 82 in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing. Optionally, applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.83. 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o) is recited below:

“(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office. They should contain as few words as possible”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-18, 20-27, 29-32, 34-42, 44-46, 48-51, 53-60, 62-65, 67-75, 77-79, 81-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kloba et al. (US Patent No. 6,421,717 B1).

Kloba anticipated independent claims 1, 11, 15, 20, 26, 29, 34, 44, 48, 53, 59, 62, 67, 77, 81, by the following:

7. As per claims 1, 34, 67, Kloba teaches “receiving a single request from a client computer, the single request identifying desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“including a plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page in an archive

Art Unit: 2177

file” at col. 15, lines 1-8, col. 16, lines 3-23;

“sending the archive file to the client computer in response to the single request” at col. 16, lines 34-45.

8. As per claims 11, 44, 77, Kloba teaches “receiving a single request from a client computer, the single request identifying a desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“generating a site map including the desired Web page” at col. 15, lines 21-27;

“sending an archive file containing the site map to the client computer in response to the single request” at col. 15, lines 9-27.

9. As per claims 15, 48, 81, Kloba teaches “receiving a single request from a client computer, the single request identifying a desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“sending an archive file containing metadata from the desired Web page to the client computer in response to the single request” at col. 15, lines 1-8.

10. As per claims 20, 53, Kloba teaches “establishing a connection with a Web server” at col. 4, lines 58-63;

“sending a single request to the Web server, the single request identifying a desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“receiving an archive file containing a plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“breaking the connection with the Web server” at col. 4, lines 56-58;

“decompressing the plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page” at col. 15,

Art Unit: 2177

lines 28-47;

“displaying the Web page after said breaking the connection” at col. 4, lines 56-58, col. 15, lines 52-58.

13. As per claims 26, 59, Kloba teaches “sending a single request to a Web server, the single request identifying a desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“receiving an archive file containing a site map including the desired Web page; and searching the site map” at col. 16, lines 34-45, col. 15, lines 21-27.

12. As per claims 29, 62, Kloba teaches “sending a single request to a Web server, the single request identifying a desired Web page” at col. 14, lines 58-65, col. 16, lines 9-11;

“receiving an archive file containing the metadata for the desired Web page; and searching the metadata” at col. 16, lines 34-45, col. 15, lines 1-8.

14. As per claims 2, 35, 68, Kloba teaches “compressing the plurality of resources associated with the desired Web page into the archive file” at col. 15, lines 33-36, col. 5, lines 21-25.

15. As per claims 3, 36, 69, Kloba teaches “selecting the archive file from a plurality of archive files” at col. 15, lines 52-58.

16. As per claims 4, 37, 70, Kloba teaches “including a plurality of resources associated with an additional Web page in the archive file” at col. 26, lines 49-64.

17. As per claims 5, 38, 71, Kloba teaches “receiving a depth value from the client computer” see Fig. 31-element LINK DEPTH;

“identifying a plurality of additional Web pages associated with the desired Web page” at col. 26, lines 49-64;

“limiting a number of Web pages in the plurality of additional Web pages using the depth value” at col. 7, lines 37-64;

“including the plurality of resources associated with the limited number of Web pages in the archive file” at col. 26, lines 49-64.

18. As per claims 6, 12, 17, 39, 45, 50, 72, 78, 83, Kloba teaches “receiving a size value from the client computer; and limiting the size of the archive file to the size value” see Fig. 31, element CHANNEL SIZE LIMIT.

19. As per claims 7, 40, 73, Kloba teaches “including metadata from the desired Web page in the archive file” at col. 15, lines 1-8.

20. As per claims 8, 16, 24, 30, 41, 49, 57, 63, 74, 82, Kloba teaches “keywords found in the desired Web page, parent Web pages of the desired Web page, child Web pages of the desired Web page, links found in the desired Web page administrative contacts for the desired Web page, and meta-tags found in the desired Web page” at col. 5, lines 21-62.

21. As per claims 9, 42, 75, Kloba teaches “including a site map in the archive file” at col. 15,

Art Unit: 2177

lines 21-27.

23. As per claims 13, 18, 32, 46, 51, 65, 79, 84, Kloba teaches “receiving a sub-string of an URL from the client computer; and wherein said generating the site map includes identifying Web pages with an URL including the sub-string” at col. 15, lines 21-27.

27. As per claims 21, 54, Kloba teaches “displaying the additional Web page after said breaking the connection” at col. 26, lines 49-64.

28. As per claims 22, 27, 31, 55, 60, 64, Kloba teaches “indicating a size value in the single request, the size value indicating the maximum size of the archive file” see Fig. 31.

29. As per claims 23, 56, Kloba teaches “searching the metadata after said breaking the connection” at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 8.

31. As per claims 25, 58, Kloba teaches “searching the site map after said breaking the connection” at col. 15, lines 21-27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

36. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the

art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

37. Claims 10, 43, 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba et al. (US Patent No. 6,421,717 B1), as applied to the rejection of claims above, in view of Becker et al. (US Patent No. 5,937,411).

38. As per claims 10, 43, 76, Kloba does not teach “authenticating a manifest file; and including the manifest file in the archive file”. However, Becker teaches this limitation at col. 2, lines 36-53, col. 3, lines 29-38.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kloba with the teachings of Becker to include “authenticating a manifest file; and including the manifest file in the archive file” in order to provide a digital signature for verifying the integrity of the archive file.

38. Claims 14,19, 28, 33, 47, 52, 61, 66, 80, 85, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kloba et al. (US Patent No. 6,421,717 B1), as applied to the rejection of claims above, in view of Burner et al. (US Patent No. 6,282,548 B1).

39. As per claims 14, 19, 47, 52, 80, 85, Kloba does not explicitly teach “receiving a value from the client computer; and limiting a number of Web pages in the site map to the value”. However, Burner teaches this limitation at col. 11, lines 18-25.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kloba with the teachings of Burner to include “receiving a value from the client computer; and limiting a number of Web pages in the site map to the value” in order to provide a way for users to see a “metaview” of available information and to be able to find the information that addresses their specific needs.

40. As per claims 28, 33, 61, 66, Kloba does not explicitly teach “indicating in the single request the maximum number of Web pages in the site map”. However, Burner teaches this limitation at col. 13, lines 12-20.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Kloba with the teachings of Burner to include “indicating in the single request the maximum number of Web pages in the site map” in order to limit the number of web pages to be displayed.

Conclusion

40. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

Art Unit: 2177

should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 746-7238. The TC 2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Miranda Le

May2, 2003



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER